



The Comptroller General
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

Decision

Matter of: Ronnoc Educational Consultants
File: B-224587
Date: September 25, 1986

DIGEST

1. Protest filed more than 10 working days after the basis of protest is known is untimely.
2. A protester's general disagreement with an agency's evaluation of its proposal does not constitute an adequately detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of a protest required by Bid Protest Regulations.

DECISION

Ronnoc Educational Consultants protests the award of a contract to Mr. Dan McGrew under request for quotations (RFQ) No. DACW87-86-Q-0139, issued by the Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville, Alabama, to conduct performance management workshops. Ronnoc contends that Mr. McGrew was selected on a basis other than the one prescribed in the RFQ's evaluation criteria, and disagrees with the Army's evaluation of its quotation.

We dismiss the protest.

The Army advised Ronnoc of the award to Mr. McGrew in an August 8, 1986, letter, which Ronnoc received on August 15, and which explained the basis for the award. The Army then conducted a debriefing with Ronnoc on August 22, and the firm filed its protest with our Office on September 2; the filing included, as supporting documentation, Ronnoc's summary of the debriefing. Ronnoc did not supply a copy of that supporting documentation to the Army.

Ronnoc's contention that the award was not consistent with the evaluation criteria is untimely. Our Bid Protest Regulations require that protests be filed within 10 working days of when the protester knows or should have known the basis for protest. 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(2) (1986). Ronnoc knew upon its August 15 receipt of the Army's August 8 letter why the

036924

contract had been awarded to Mr. McGrew, but the firm did not protest until September 2, more than 10 working days later.

Accordingly, this basis for protest is untimely and we will not consider it on the merits. See General Elevator Co., Inc., B-217453, Jan. 18, 1985, 85-1 C.P.D. ¶ 64.

Ronnoc's second contention concerns the Army's evaluation of its proposal. In response, the Army argues that Ronnoc's protest letter does not provide an adequately detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of protest as required by our Bid Protest Regulations, 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(c)(4).

We agree with the Army. The cited requirement in our Regulations contemplates a statement sufficient to apprise the procuring agency of the specific aspects of the procurement to which the protester objects, and the reasons for the objection, rather than general expressions of dissatisfaction about not receiving an award. See GTT Industries, Inc., B-220824, Nov. 5, 1985, 85-2 C.P.D. ¶ 527. However, in its protest, and even in the debriefing summary provided only to our Office, Ronnoc merely summarizes its understanding of the weaknesses that the Army found in its proposal and states that it disagrees with those weaknesses. Ronnoc also asks general questions as to how the Army qualifies its technical evaluators and how the agency evaluated Ronnoc's price. Ronnoc has not provided, in any detail, its basis for objecting to the Army's evaluation of its proposal as contemplated by our Regulations. See Anchor Appliance--Request for Reconsideration, B-223496.2, July 28, 1986, 86-2 C.P.D. ¶ 123.

Ronnoc also complains about the thoroughness of the Corps' response to the firm's request for materials under the Freedom of Information Act. The Corps, however, informally advises that Ronnoc submitted its request in an August 8 letter, and that on August 18 the Corps provided Ronnoc with all items specifically requested. In any event, we point out that our Office has no legal authority to determine what information another agency must disclose under the Freedom of Information Act. See RCA Service Co., B-219636, Nov. 4, 1985, 85-2 C.P.D. ¶ 518

The protest is dismissed.

John F. Mitchell
Robert M. Strong
for Deputy Associate
General Counsel